

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 592

HE 015 012

AUTHOR Coleman, Nancy
TITLE Toward Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education: A Conceptual Frame of Reference and Guidelines for Organizing Equity Efforts.

INSTITUTION Council on Social Work Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Women's Educational Equity Act Program (ED), Washington, DC.

PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 61p.
AVAILABLE FROM Council on Social Work Education, 111 Eighth Ave., Suite 501, New York, NY 10011 (\$6.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; Change Strategies; College Faculty; College Planning; *College Programs; College Students; Curriculum Development; Educational Quality; *Equal Education; Extracurricular Activities; *Females; Higher Education; Models; *Professional Education; *Social Work; Student Needs

IDENTIFIERS *Project on Achieving Equity for Women Soc Work Ed

ABSTRACT

An overview of activities of the Project on Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education between July 1979 and June 1981 is presented. The main objective was to seek information about alternative strategies to achieve educational equity, and to construct a frame of reference that could be used universally to organize efforts to improve the quality of educational programs as they relate to female administrators, faculty, and students, and to curriculum content that addresses distinctive needs of women. After briefly providing a historical perspective, a summary is presented of 226 responses to the first part of a questionnaire seeking information from social work programs about curriculum content on women in required and elective courses, and about extracurricular activities that pertain to women's concerns. A summary is also presented of 131 anonymous responses to the second part of the questionnaire, which sought information about barriers to achieving equity for women. Barriers that were reported include barriers in curriculum planning and teaching, and noncurriculum barriers that relate to the profession, to the institution, to administrators and faculty, and to students. The development of five specific plans to achieve educational equity are institutional factors, consultant's relationship to program, organization of work group, focus of change efforts, selection of strategies for change, projected outcomes, monitoring and evaluation, and institutionalizing the gains. Limitations and problems encountered at program sites, and guidelines for achieving equity are examined. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Toward Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education:

A Conceptual Frame of Reference
and Guidelines for Organizing Equity Efforts

By
Nancy Coleman, DSW

Developed by Project on Achieving Equity
for Women in Social Work Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Council on
Social Work
Education*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Council on Social Work Education
New York

Copyright © 1981 by the Council on Social Work Education, Inc.

All Rights Reserved.

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 81-70373.

Printed in the United States of America.

The opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the policy or position of the Council on Social Work Education. No official endorsement of the views presented should be inferred unless it is so indicated.

Council on Social Work Education
Richard A. English, President
Arthur J. Katz, Executive Director
111 Eighth Avenue, New York, New York 10011
(212) 242-3800

FOREWORD

While women constitute a majority of social work practitioners and a large proportion of social work's clientele, the issue of women as students, faculty, and administrators, and the curriculum content on the subject of women only recently have been given sufficient attention in social work education.

This monograph is one of a number of continued efforts by the Council on Social Work Education to focus on issues related to women in social work education.

Soon after the establishment of the Council's Commission on the Role and Status of Women in Social Work Education in 1974, a need was identified for a special project to address the inequities experienced by women. Major issues were identified by the commission. Subsequently, a proposal was developed and a two-year project was initiated with support from the U.S. Department of Education, Women's Educational Equity Act Program. This publication is a report on the project.

Barriers to the recruitment, retention, promotion, tenure, and remuneration concerning women are identified. Attention is given to issues related to student admissions, field placement, and financial aid. The need for clear course objectives, outlines, and content respecting the role and status of women throughout the curriculum is clearly delineated in this monograph.

Finally, the report outlines five specific strategies to overcome the barriers identified in social work education.

The Council is gratified to present this valuable document as an extremely useful contribution in its own right, and as a basis for continuing efforts to achieve equity for women in social work education.

CSWE wishes to thank Nancy Coleman and the many social work educators and practitioners who participated in this most successful project.

New York City
November 1981

ARTHUR J. KATZ
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PREFACE

In 1974 the United States Congress established the Women's Educational Equity Act which authorizes the U.S. Education Department to award grants and contracts "to provide educational equity for women in the United States and to provide financial assistance to enable educational agencies and institutions to meet requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972." The following words marked the establishment of the Act:

The Congress hereby finds and declares that educational programs in the United States...as presently conducted, are inequitable, as such programs relate to women and frequently limit the full participation of all individuals in American society. It is the purpose of this section to provide educational equity for all women in the United States.

The Council on Social Work Education's Commission on the Role and Status of Women in Social Work Education agreed that efforts were needed to achieve equity for women in professional education and submitted a proposal for a two year project to and received funding from the Women's Educational Equity Act Program for the period July 1979 to June 1981. This publication reports on efforts of the Project on Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education.

The project gathered information from accredited social work programs about alternative strategies and barriers to achieving equity for women and provided consultation to five programs in different Federal regions to test out unique approaches to achieving equity for women. These efforts led to the construction of a conceptual frame of reference and guidelines for organizing educational equity efforts for women.

The project consultants worked closely with the project director in setting up project objectives and in constructing a conceptual tool that could be adapted to various educational settings. They also worked closely with administrators and work groups in five social work educational programs to develop unique approaches to achieving equity for women. I am indebted to them for their willingness to share their expertise and wisdom.

This publication represents the efforts of a great many persons, all committed to the goal of equality in higher education. It is hoped that the recommendations set forth here will stimulate others to make similar efforts to work for equity for persons in their own educational settings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Listed below are some of the many people in social work education and practice who contributed their time and expertise to project efforts to achieve educational equity for women. The sustaining interest and commitment of all who were involved are gratefully acknowledged.

Advisory Group/ Project Consultants

Jeanne Giovannoni
Naomi Gottlieb
Mary Gay Harm
Anne Jones
Juliette Silva

Project Secretary

Lillian Lent

Project Associate

Kathleen Powell

Deans and Directors

Raymond H. Clark
William H. Gilbertson
Isaiah Lee
Kate Mullins
Bernard Pendleton
Ethelyn Strong

Members of Work Groups

John Austin
Elsie Brevik
Katherine Briar
Charlene Cheston
Carolyn Dryzcimski
Kay Evans
Vern Hansen
Georgia Henson
Jim Kelly
Joanne Kurfiss

Robin Landry
Claire Lowry
Dorothy McCadd
Pam Miller
Mark Mimich
Thelma Payne
Rosemary Phillips
Neila Seshachari
Malrie Shelton
Neillie Tate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	iii
PREFACE	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
CHAPTER I: SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION ADDRESSES THE NEED TO ACHIEVE EQUITY FOR WOMEN	1
Council on Social Work Education Adopts Affirmative Action Accreditation Standard	1
U.S. Education Department Funds Project on Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education	2
Project Reports and Makes Recommendations to Social Work Educators	2
CHAPTER II: ACHIEVING EQUITY FOR WOMEN IN THE SOCIAL WORK CURRICULUM	4
Focus of Survey: Part I	4
Content on Women in Required Courses: Human Behavior and Social Environment, Social Welfare Policies and Services, Social Work Practice or Methods and Research	4
Content on Women in Required Courses: Field or Practicum	5
Content on Women in Elective Courses	6
Curriculum Decisionmakers	9
Extracurricular Opportunities Re Women's Concerns	10
Plans for Revision of Curriculum	11
CHAPTER III: BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING EQUITY FOR WOMEN IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION	12
Focus of Survey: Part II	12
Barriers in Curriculum Planning and Teaching	13
Non-Curriculum Barriers to Achieving Equity for Women	17
Overview of Responses to Part II	19

CHAPTER IV: DEVELOPING SPECIFIC PLANS OF ACTION TO ACHIEVE EQUITY FOR WOMEN	21
Selection of Program Sites	21
Assignment of Consultants to Program Sites	22
Establishment of Working Agreements and Work Groups at Program Sites	23
Development of Plans of Action by Program Sites	23
CHAPTER V: A FRAME OF REFERENCE FOR ACHIEVING EQUITY	25
Institutional Factors	25
Consultant's Relationship to the Institution and to the Social Work Program	28
Organization of Work Group	32
Foci of Change Efforts	34
Selection of Strategies for Change	37
Projected Outcomes	40
Monitoring and Evaluation	41
Institutionalizing the Gains	42
CHAPTER VI: SUMMARY AND GUIDELINES	43
Historical Perspective	43
Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education: An Overview	43
Developing Five Specific Plans of Action to Achieve Equity	45
A Frame of Reference for Achieving Equity	45
Limitations and Problems	48
Guidelines for Use of the Frame of Reference to Achieve Equity	49
Toward a Non-Sexist Learning Environment	51
NOTES	53

CHAPTER I

SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION ADDRESSES THE NEED TO ACHIEVE EQUITY FOR WOMEN

Council on Social Work Education Adopts Affirmative Action Accreditation Standard

Efforts to meet requirements of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare Executive Order 11246 for affirmative action, Equal Employment Opportunity Legislation, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, and to respond to questions of inequity generated by the Women's Movement, led the Board of Directors of the Council on Social Work Education (on the recommendation of its Accreditation Commission) to approve the adoption in 1977 of an affirmative action accreditation standard for women.¹

Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women went further than a statement of policy against discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, ethnic or national origin, handicap, age or sex. The standard states that, if any social work educational program at the baccalaureate or master's level seeks accredited status (initial or reaccredited), the program must make "specific continuous efforts to assure enrichment by the presence of women in all categories of persons related to the program, and by content on women's issues in the curriculum." The standard elaborates on three ways equity for women must be achieved if social work programs are to maintain accredited status. These are:

1. Equity shall be assured to women in faculty and staff recruitment, retention, promotion, tenure assignment, and remuneration.
2. Equity shall be assured to women in student admissions, field placement, and financial aid.
3. The program shall provide clear course objectives, outline and content respecting the role and status of women throughout the curriculum.²

The profession of social work is the first profession to develop an affirmative action accreditation standard for women. The profession had earlier established a precedent when it enacted a similar accreditation standard for members of ethnic minority groups.

Once accreditation standard 1234B-Women was enacted, the focus shifted to accredited social work educational programs which

had the responsibility of finding ways to implement the mandates of the standard. Administrators of many of these programs expressed uncertainty about the most effective approaches to achieving equity for women (i.e. meeting the requirements of the standard).

U.S. Education Department Funds
Project on Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education

The Council on Social Work Education's Commission on the Role and Status of Women in Social Work Education, whose role it is to monitor and recommend policy regarding women's issues to the Council's Board of Directors, decided that a special project was needed to assess the state of the art of curriculum focused on distinctive needs of women, to identify barriers to achieving equity for women, and to explore alternative strategies to quality improvement in the ways that social work programs address distinctive needs of women. A subcommittee of the Women's Commission developed a proposal idea. The proposal was developed in written form by staff, who submitted it to the U.S. Education Department, Women's Educational Equity Act Program. Funding was approved for a two-year project beginning July 1, 1979. It is important to note at the outset that this project focused on the three areas identified in Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women (women faculty, women students, and curriculum content on women), but it in no way intruded upon or became a part of the official accreditation process of the Council on Social Work Education. The project agreed that at the end of the two years, it would report to social work educational programs regarding what it had learned about alternative approaches to achieving educational equity for women.

During the two-year period, the project carried out two different phases. Phase I involved a survey of all accredited social work educational programs to learn about the "state of the art" in curriculum content on women, and to collect information about barriers to achieving educational equity for women. Phase II focused on the selection of five program sites, and the development of different models of achieving equity for women. The project provided consultation to these sites and asked that they develop unique plans of action to achieve equity for women.

Project Reports and Makes Recommendations
to Social Work Educators

It was the intention of the project from its inception to share information about its activities with social work educational

programs at the baccalureate and master's levels. It was hoped that ideas about alternative strategies to achieve educational equity for women learned through project efforts might be transferrable to other social work programs striving to update curriculum content on women, and to provide greater advancement opportunities for female faculty and students.

This publication has been prepared by the project director in collaboration with an advisory group of consultants. The document draws upon statements in a manual developed during the first project year with the assistance of a project associate (doctoral intern), upon written reports of consultants summarizing professional activities at program sites and upon written statements from administrators and work groups at the project sites. These written materials were used by the project director and consultants as the foundation for the construction of a conceptual frame of reference for organizing equity efforts in professional education.

The project had two main goals: one, to learn from social work educators about alternative strategies being used to achieve educational equity for women and about barriers impeding equity efforts and two, to develop a frame of reference and guidelines which could be used by persons involved in equity efforts throughout the country.

This document reports on project activities related to goal one in the first three chapters. The project presents an historical orientation(Chapter I) and an overview of the "state of the art" in curriculum content on women(Chapter II). Ideas about barriers to achieving educational equity for women are summarized(Chapter III). Content in Chapters Two and Three is based on responses to a questionnaire mailed to all accredited social work programs in 1980 and on responses to a follow-up questionnaire in 1981.

Chapters IV through VI address project goal two. A statement of how the project organized efforts to select and to provide consultation to five program sites during 1980 to 1981 is given (Chapter IV). The end result of project efforts in five program sites is presented in a conceptual frame of reference constructed by the project director and consultants to organize ideas about approaches to achieving educational equity for women(Chapter V). A summary of project accomplishments is followed by a set of guidelines for using the frame of reference(Chapter VI).

CHAPTER II

ACHIEVING EQUITY FOR WOMEN IN THE SOCIAL WORK CURRICULUM

Focus of Survey: Part I

In January 1980 a two-part questionnaire was mailed by the Project to the administrators of all accredited social work educational programs at the baccalaureate and master's levels.³ Part I of the questionnaire sought information about "curriculum content in which women's distinctive needs and problems are addressed." The administrators were asked to respond to questions in the time frame of 1978 to 1979. If administrators asked other persons to assist them in completing the questionnaires, they were told to list their names and titles below their own signatures. Part I of the questionnaire was not designed to elicit detailed responses but rather to provide information which would give an overview of what was being taught about women and how it was being organized in the curriculum. One hundred eighty-one baccalaureate administrators and forty-five master's level administrators responded to Part I of the questionnaire. A follow-up questionnaire was mailed to these administrators in 1981 asking them to report any changes in curriculum content between academic year 1978 to 1979 and academic year 1980 to 1981. One hundred eighty-five responses to the follow-up questionnaire were received (82% of those responding to first questionnaire).

Content on Women in Required Courses: Human Behavior and Social Environment, Social Welfare Policies and Services, Social Work Practice or Methods and Research

Question A in Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents to give the number of required social work courses (except field or practicum), and to list the catalog numbers and titles of required courses which contain content on women. Since the project was primarily concerned about seeking ideas about achieving equity to incorporate into a conceptual frame of reference, it did not ask respondents to give detailed information about the nature of content on women in these required courses. Responses to Question A provided a "broad brush" overview of how many and which required courses contained content on women.

The responses of baccalaureate administrators who answered Part I of the questionnaire showed that the majority of baccalaureate programs reporting concentrate content on women in at least one-half of courses offered in Social Welfare Policy

and Services and in one-half of the courses in Social Work Practice or Methods. The majority reported that content on women in Human Behavior and Social Environment courses is concentrated in at least one-third of the required courses. A number of baccalaureate administrators pointed out that these courses are often taught by faculty from other departments. They reported that content on women is not usually incorporated into baccalaureate research courses except through opportunities to write about special topics. Two-thirds of the baccalaureate programs responding reported that there were additional required courses with content on women. These included Introduction to Social Work, Senior Seminars, Intercultural Relationships and Minority Concerns, the Family, and Special Topics.

The majority of master's program respondents reported that at least half of the courses required in Social Welfare Policy and Services, in Human Behavior and Social Environment, and in Research contain content on women. Master's program respondents reported a larger number of required courses in Social Work Practice or Methods, with one-fourth to one-third of these courses reported to contain content on women. Required master's courses in the "other" category which include content on women were focused on discrimination and ethnicity.

Follow-up responses to the questionnaire showed that the majority of programs reporting had no major changes in required courses. Approximately one-fourth of the respondents indicated that content on women was added to Human Behavior and Social Environment courses during the 1980-1981 academic year.

Responses to Question A provided only general information about content on women in required courses. These responses also provided a base upon which to analyze responses to later questions pertaining to specific content on women in field, in electives and in extracurricular learning opportunities.

Content on Women in Required Courses: Field or Practicum

Question B in Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents to list the names of organizations which teach field students to work with and for women, and to describe briefly the types of field assignments. The project recognized that most field placements provide the opportunity to relate to some women clients. The purpose of Question B was to gather information about the types of assignments which specifically address distinctive needs of women.

Seventy-one percent of the baccalaureate and master's program responding to the questionnaire reported field assignments

which address special concerns of women, many of which deal with crisis situations. These include battered women shelters, women's information and referral centers, "hot lines," rape and abuse centers, services for Lesbians and divorced women, centers for single parents and displaced homemakers. The types of field placements reported which focus on distinctive needs of women are listed in Table 1 in descending order of percentages of programs reporting their use.

There was no observable difference in the types of field assignments reported by baccalaureate and master's programs. A higher percentage of master's program respondents did state that all of their field placements focus on distinctive needs of women. A higher percentage of baccalaureate programs provided greater detail about the specific focus of learning opportunities which address distinctive needs of women in field settings.

Follow-up responses to the questionnaire revealed a continuation of the same types of setting. Several settings added to the lists provided field opportunities for preemployment and employment counseling (such as Urban League Program) in 1980-1981.

Content on Women in Elective Courses

Question C of Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents to give the total number of elective courses offered in their programs during academic year 1978-1979. In addition, they were asked to list the catalog numbers and titles of elective courses offered during that year which contained content on women.

Ninety percent of baccalaureate and master's respondents reported that their programs offered one or more electives with content on women. One-tenth of these reported that there was a Women's Studies program available in the parent institution. Electives with content on women fell into two categories: 1. electives with the word "woman" or "female" in their titles, and 2. electives whose titles did not contain the word "woman" or "female."

TABLE 1

Types of Field Assignments and Percentages of Respondents Reporting Their Use

Types of Field Assignments with Content on Women	% Respondents Reporting Use
Women's Special Concerns (i.e. crisis centers, shelters, hot lines, rape and abuse centers, YWCA programs for pregnant adolescents, single parent and displaced homemaker counseling, etc.)	71%
Children and Adolescents (i.e. runaway houses, special care, group homes, schools, child guidance, Head Start, day care, Big Sister and Brothers, YWCA, Girls' Club, Girl Scouts, Salvation Army, etc.)	59%
Health (i.e. public departments, nursing, early infant care, clinics, general and V.A. hospitals, women's health programs, etc.)	43%
Public Social Services (i.e. housing, public welfare, human resources, welfare rights, etc.)	40%
Voluntary Family Services (i.e. under auspices that are Jewish, Catholic, Lutheran, Salvation Army, American Red Cross, etc.)	33%
Corrections (i.e. Family and Juvenile Court, retention centers, Sheriff's Department, victim witness programs, probation, etc.)	31%
Mental Health (i.e. community, psychiatric hospitals, etc.)	29%
Planned Parenthood, Family Planning, Genetic Counseling	25%
Legal Aid, Advocacy, Community Organization (i.e. Legal Aid Society, Feminist Union, Advocacy Task Forces, Community Action Corps, United Way, etc.)	20%
Aging (i.e. nursing homes, retirement villages, RSVP, day care centers, community centers, Area Agency on Aging, etc.)	20%
Physical Impairment and Handicaps (i.e. Easter Seal, developmentally disabled, rehabilitation, etc.)	14%
Other (i.e. immigration services, university testing and counseling, employment counseling, neighborhood centers, etc.)	12%

Only fifteen percent of electives with content on women had "women" or "female" in the titles. These were reported by less than half of the baccalaureate and master's programs responding to the questionnaire.

Electives with "women" in their titles most frequently offered by baccalaureate programs were courses that began "Women in...." These focused on women in history, art, society, literature, religion, psychology, and philosophy. Electives with "woman" in their titles most frequently reported by master's programs began "Women and...." These focused on policy, health, mental health, management, work, social work, and leadership. A higher percentage of master's programs reported that they offered electives focused on social work practice with women.

Other electives with "woman" in their titles reported by both baccalaureate and master's respondents included Women and Social Change Movements, Changing Male and Female Roles, Women in Corrections, Working-Class Women, Female Victims of Abuse, Aging Women, The Black Woman, La Chicana, and Asian-American Women.

Eighty-five percent of electives reported to have content on women by baccalaureate and master's programs did not contain the word "woman" or "female" in their titles. The topics most frequently addressed by over half of the respondents include health and mental health, substance abuse, Social Work and the Family, Child Welfare and Day Care, Law and Corrections, sexuality and sexism, ethnicity and racism, and gerontology.

The majority of follow-up responses to Part I of the questionnaire showed no change in electives. Approximately fifteen percent of those responding added one or two electives which focused on Women in Crisis, Aging Women, Religion and Women's Issues, Health, Women's Issues and the Family, Women and Minorities in the Work Force, and Women's Educational and Professional Development during the academic year 1980-1981.

Curriculum Decisionmakers

Question E of Part I of the questionnaire reads as follows:

Put a check (✓) beside one or more categories of persons who made recommendations (Column B) and/or decisions (Column C) re inclusion or revision of content on women during academic year 1978-1979:

Academic Year 1978-1979: Persons or Groups Making Recommendations*and/or Decisions* re Inclusion or Revision of Curriculum Content on Women		
A Person or Group	B Made Recommendations Please Check (✓)	C Made Decisions Please Check (✓)
General Curriculum Committee	()	()
Specific Curriculum Committee (Give Name)	()	()
Women's Caucus or Committee	()	()
Faculty Group	()	()
Student Group	()	()
Administrative Head of Program	()	()
Faculty Administratively Assigned to Women's Studies	()	()
Faculty Teaching Course	()	()
Other (Please Specify)	()	()

*Recommendation is a suggestion; decision is suggestion that is implemented.

The majority of respondents checked more than one category. The five sources of recommendations checked most frequently by baccalaureate respondents were faculty teaching course (58%), curriculum committee (55%), administrative head (50%), faculty as a group (50%) and student group (41%). The same order was given for sources of decisions, as shown in Table 2. These were faculty teaching course (61%), curriculum committees (51%), administrative head (45%), faculty as a group (40%) and student group (10%).

The five sources of recommendations most frequently checked by master's respondents were curriculum committee (99%), faculty teaching course (63%), administrative head (43%), student group (37%) and faculty as a group (36%). There was a change in the order of sources of decisions checked most frequently by master's respondents, as shown in Table 2. These were curriculum committee (71%), faculty teaching course (50%), faculty as a group (32%), administrative head (22%) and student group (7%).

In addition less than ten percent of baccalaureate and master's respondents checked the following sources for recommendations: women's caucus, faculty administratively assigned to subject area,

affirmative action officer, field faculty, and faculty senate or campus-wide group.

TABLE 2		
Categories of Persons Making Curriculum Recommendations and Decisions (In Descending Order of Numbers Reported)		
Baccalaureate Level	Master's Level	
Persons Reported to Make Both Recommendations AND Decisions	Persons Reported to Make Recommendations	Persons Reported to Make Decisions
-Faculty Teaching Course(s) -Curriculum Committee -Administrative Head -Faculty as a Group -Student Group	-Curriculum Committee -Faculty Teaching Course(s) -Administrative Head -Student Group -Faculty as a Group	-Curriculum Committee -Faculty Teaching Course(s) -Faculty as a Group -Administrative Head -Student Group

Follow-up responses to the questionnaire showed that the same categories of persons recommended and made decisions about curriculum content on women as were reported in 1980. Several programs reported that they were also using input from an alumni council into curriculum recommendations during academic year 1980-1981.

Extracurricular Opportunities Re Women's Concerns

Question D of Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents to describe briefly special assignments or learning opportunities regarding women's concerns offered by their programs in academic year 1978 to 1979. Eighty-five percent of respondents listed extracurricular opportunities. The activities listed were wide-ranging. They included special programs focused on women's concerns organized into one-day conferences, colloquia, workshops, lectures, conferences, "brown bag" lunches, symposia, weekend retreats, and "Common Day" programs. Opportunities were provided for students to meet women in prisons, women who were rape victims, women in special service settings, and women involved in preretirement planning. Many of these activities were offered in the parent institution or in the community. Similar activities were reported by baccalaureate and master's respondents.

Responses to the follow-up questionnaire in 1981 showed that most programs were continuing with the above activities. Additional

extracurricular activities reported in follow-up questionnaires included an outreach program for women in rural areas, a Women's Resource Fair, and advocacy programs for abused women.

Plans for Revision of Curriculum

Question F of Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents to list any plans their programs had for improvement/revision of curriculum content on women.

Twenty-eight percent of respondents from both levels reported that they had no plans for revision of curriculum content on women. Forty-three percent reported that a general review of curriculum content would be undertaken but no revision activities were anticipated. The remaining twenty-nine percent anticipated that the following activities would take place during the next academic year (listed in descending order of numbers of programs reporting): add special interest elective (i.e. family therapy, alternate life styles, aging, family violence, feminist human services, child welfare, human sexuality), add to core content (i.e. content on sexism, middle years, ethnicity, Lesbians, child welfare, sexuality), encourage students to enroll in university women's studies programs, construct mechanisms to monitor curricula, add to library resources, develop video-tapes, construct and introduce conceptual frameworks, plan conferences on an annual basis, set up weekly discussion groups.

Responses to follow-up questionnaires indicated that most programs were continuing with plans to review content on women in their programs. Twenty percent of the respondents reported efforts directed toward faculty such as recruitment of more female faculty (especially ethnic), provision of more role models through use of part-time faculty and lecturers, setting up of a women's support group of faculty and staff to pressure the administration of the university for more equitable policies and procedures, and conducting a faculty development seminar on sexism. In addition, many respondents reported that they were reviewing new Federal policies to see how they will impact on women. Several respondents reported on a continuing search for unbiased textbooks.

CHAPTER III

BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING EQUITY FOR WOMEN IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Focus of Survey: Part II

One of the major objectives of the project was to construct a conceptual frame of reference for achieving equity for women in social work education. In order to build this frame of reference, the project sought information about two topics: 1. how to achieve equity for women faculty and students and curricula, and 2. what were existing barriers to achieving equity for women. Two major sources of information were used. They were data gathered from questionnaires mailed to accredited social work programs and data gathered from five program sites selected to develop specific plans or models to achieve equity.

Chapter III summarizes barriers reported in responses to Part II of the questionnaire mailed to accredited social work programs. In the introduction to Part II of the questionnaire, the following statements were made:

The project seeks to deepen its understanding of problems and issues in achieving educational equity for women. It hopes that you will be willing to recommend ways to improve educational programs and to overcome barriers to achieving equity for women. While this questionnaire is focused on women, it is believed that the information you give can be used in improving educational programs for all persons.

If you wish your responses to be anonymous, please return the form unsigned.

One hundred thirty-one baccalaureate and master's programs responded to Part II of the questionnaire. This questionnaire consisted of four sections, as follows: Section I--Curriculum Planning, Section II--Educational Planning for Female Students and Strategies for Improvement, Section III--Status of Female Faculty and Staff and Strategies for Improvement, and Section IV--Definition of Educational Equity in Social Work Education.

Barriers to achieving equity for women in social work education are reported in this chapter as ideas expressed by one or more respondents. No attempt is made to add up numbers of similar responses or to estimate how many social work programs are faced with the barriers identified. This summary of responses is presented with the assumption that those working to achieve

equity for women in social work education recognize that some barriers exist in all programs, all barriers reported do not exist in all programs, and that more effective strategies can be developed if barriers are understood.

Barriers in Curriculum Planning and Teaching

In Chapter I it was noted that an affirmative action accreditation standard had been passed in 1977 by the Council on Social Work Education's Board of Directors at the recommendation of their Accreditation Commission. One of the areas addressed in Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women was curriculum. The 1977 version of the standard stated that an accredited social work program "must provide clear course objectives, outline and content respecting the role and status of women throughout the curriculum."⁴

In Part II of the questionnaire, respondents were asked if there were any concerns regarding planning or teaching about distinctive needs of women in relation to the following aspects of curriculum planning and teaching:

1. How content on women relates to the objectives and mission of the educational program.
2. How the program reorganizes to update curriculum content.
3. What the sequence and emphasis in teaching about women should be.
4. What the rationale for inclusion of content on women is in:
 - a. required courses
 - b. elective courses
 - c. women's studies programs or interdepartmental offerings.
5. Resources relevant to women which exist outside the social work educational program in:
 - a. the total university
 - b. the community
6. The use of the advising process in helping women to develop educational and career plans.
7. The integration of content in class and field.
8. The role of curriculum committees, caucuses, faculty, and student groups.
9. The quality of curriculum materials and teaching technology.
10. The establishment of a non-sexist learning environment.

Statements which are representative of the kinds of responses given to Part II of the questionnaire are presented under each aspect of curriculum planning and teaching.

Barriers re Objectives and Mission of Program

Many respondents reported that knowledge about distinctive needs of women is not usually designated as central to an educational program even though the majority of professional social workers and clients are women. Seldom does a program state that it is concerned with gender equality. Programs do not usually spell out their missions regarding specific population groups, but even when they do it is hard to find references to women in these groups through the curriculum.

Barriers re Curriculum Reorganization

It was noted by a number of respondents that initiators of change in curriculum differ throughout social work education. In many graduate schools of social work an "anchorperson" or faculty member administratively assigned to a curriculum area initiates proposed changes or a curriculum committee consents to changes. In many small baccalaureate programs the director or the total faculty initiates changes. Wherever the setting, respondents identified a need for developing more effective mechanisms for periodic review, evaluation, and updating of curriculum.

Barriers re Sequence and Emphasis in Content

The major barrier to achieving expertise in sequencing and emphasizing content on women was cited as insufficient testing of alternative approaches to curriculum organization. Respondents reported that often content is "tacked" on without considering the nature of the student body and faculty, the mission of the program, and "the state of the art."

Barriers re Rationale for Inclusion of Content

In required courses respondents indicated that sufficient attention is not given to the fact that all curriculum areas touch on concerns of women. The nature of the content will determine its placement in required courses. Degrees of commitment of faculty and students to teaching about women in required courses vary greatly.

In elective courses, respondents thought that problems seem to lie in a lack of understanding of the role of elective courses in the curriculum in regard to supplementing knowledge, offering new knowledge, and focusing in-depth on topics of special interest.

Respondents believed that the rationale for presenting content on women in university-wide women's studies programs or in interdepartmental offerings reveals ambivalence on the part of curriculum planners. While there is recognition of the potential of enhanced learning opportunities, there is a tendency in some programs to route all learning about women to courses offered in the broad university, and to evade the responsibility of addressing distinctive needs of women in the professional curriculum.

Barrier re Use of Resources Outside the Social Work Program

Respondents complained that many administrators and faculty have worn "blinders" and have not been alert to learning opportunities and resources pertaining to women which exist in the total university or in the surrounding community. These include women's institutes, centers, caucuses, affirmative action offices, shelters, women's leadership programs, etc.

Barriers re Advising Process

Problems cited by respondents which occur in the advising process revolve around the failure of the advisor to help a woman to set objectives relevant to her potential and talents, to advise her of the availability of all concentrations, and to offer help in dealing with sex role stereotyping, which is common in institutional life. Respondents expressed the belief that faculty who serve as advisors are often unaware of their own stereotypic stances. A "typical" stance cited was that of the advisor counseling a man toward an administrative track of learning and a woman toward a direct service track.

Barriers re Integration of Class and Field

One major barrier cited by respondents was that individual faculty members and coordinators of field placements do not always set a priority on integration of class and field content. In addition issues related to content on women are not often placed on the agendas of either curriculum committees or of field planning committees. Many examples were cited of

students being assigned to field learning at women's crisis centers without any attempt to address the meaning of crisis for women in class content. Some respondents blamed administrators for not assigning a faculty member to coordinate class and field planning. Even if a program has conducted an ongoing faculty development program to orient faculty to contemporary issues concerning women and men, field instructors and part-time faculty are usually not included and are not aware of the faculty's commitment.

Barriers re Role of Curriculum Committees and Caucuses

Respondents indicated that a problem arises when groups convene in universities to discuss concerns of women. The problem seems to lie in the fact that these are often well-meaning groups which are regarded as hostile to planning carried out by traditional curriculum committees. Administrators are not always aware that they can set the climate for mutual respect and for coordination of efforts of these groups with efforts of the curriculum committees.

Barriers re Quality of Curriculum Materials and Teaching Technology

Respondents indicated that there is a general lack of recognition that it is impossible for a single faculty member to monitor teaching approaches, to review theories and textbooks for stereotypic views, and to keep up to date on new areas of knowledge. Faculty who have expertise often do not articulate what they are teaching in syllabi and in course outlines that can be shared with others. The major barrier is the tendency of many faculty to work alone rather than to organize a group effort to improve the quality of curriculum materials and teaching technology.

Barriers re Establishment of Non-sexist Learning Environment

A handful of respondents thought that this is not achievable. Those who thought it to be a worthwhile goal blamed administrators for lack of visible support for equality in education, and for lack of effort in hiring administrators and faculty free of sexist biases. Respondents referred to the lack of a climate which supports free expression of ideas and feelings by men and women throughout the educational process. There is lack of awareness by faculty and students of the variety of ways sexism is expressed in an institution. A major problem is "tolerating" differences rather than encouraging innovation and creativity.

Non-Curriculum Barriers to Achieving Equity for Women

When Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women was proposed, its authors recognized that if equity is to be achieved for women in social work education, special efforts must be made in non-curriculum areas as well as in curriculum content. The 1977 version of Standard 1234B-Women stated that:

1. Equity shall be assured to women in faculty and staff recruitment, retention, promotion, tenure, assignment, and remuneration.
2. Equity shall be assured to women in student admissions, field placement, and financial aid.⁵

The questions in Part II of the project questionnaire asked respondents whether there were barriers to achieving equity for women in non-curriculum areas. Statements which are representative of the kinds of responses given to Part II are presented in categories of barriers in the profession, barriers in the institution, barriers affecting administrators and faculty, and barriers affecting students. As stated earlier, respondents were not required to sign Part II of the questionnaire. Responses were given anonymously.

Barriers in the Profession

A number of respondents pointed out that social work education operates within the historical traditions and value orientations of the profession. They thought that professional organizations should be more visible in their support of gender equality. An accrediting organization should maintain strong guidelines re equity for women, create task forces to monitor educational policies and practices, and set up workshops to sensitize educators to the concerns of women in the profession, and in higher education.

Barriers in the Institution

Barriers in the institution were explained by respondents as resulting from holding on to old values and traditions which view women as "second-class citizens." Those concerned about these barriers pointed to a lack of understanding of the pervasiveness of institutional sexism. Respondents thought that there is a lack of flexibility in the educational requirements

of many universities. Some gave examples of a bias against appointing women to top administrative posts and to "male dominated" Boards of Regents. Several respondents pointed out that in some institutions there is "absolute silence" concerning women's contributions throughout all fields of study.

Barriers Affecting Administrators and Faculty

Attitudinal Barriers:

Respondents, many of whom are male administrators, identified attitudes which produce biased behavior toward women. These include apathy, insensitivity, indifference, self-interest, a "closed mind," hostility, and resistance. Men and women possessing these characteristics were said to be tradition oriented, negative toward affirmative action efforts, and subtle in the use of discriminating behavior. Male administrators possessing these attitudes were labeled as "elitist," uncommitted to being an equal opportunity employer, and biased toward men as more competent than women. A few thought that some female administrators had a "Queen Bee Complex" which they defined as "women who forget other women" when they "make it to the top."

Responses in this category were given anonymously, and were accompanied by many examples of incidents in which respondents thought women had not been treated on an equal footing with men.

Barriers in Employment Practices:

The problems which bar women faculty from receiving treatment equal to that received by male faculty were said to lie in policies and procedures pertaining to hiring, promotion, advancement, retention, tenure, and compensation. Female faculty were reported by the majority of respondents as hired for lower salaries, and lower priority (soft money) positions where there is less responsibility. One-fourth of the respondents reported on situations where there is "harassment" or "intimidation" of female candidates for positions. Many of the examples given referred to discrimination against more "mature" applicants (age 40 and older).

Respondents referred to criteria for retention and advancement as "empirically defined by males." Acceptable behaviors on the job were reported to be more "constricted" for female faculty.

One example cited was that a man who is assertive shows "leadership capacity," while an assertive woman is judged to be "hostile." Respondents thought that the female must be "scholarly, congenial, and superior" to her male counterpart if she is to be advanced or granted tenure. Some respondents believed that there are more opportunities for male faculty to engage in "extra salary" projects (i.e. research). Male faculty were viewed as having more mentors in the administrative structure of the institution.

Barriers Affecting Students

Respondents identified certain groups of female students as being more vulnerable within higher education. These include female applicants for doctoral programs, women reentering the profession after marriage and family experiences, single parents and heads of households who need an income while in training for a career, women from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, minority women, rural women from conservative backgrounds, physically impaired women, and women who are under 25 or over 40 years of age. Barriers to recruiting members of these groups were reported to be found in the lack of supports (fiscal and non-fiscal), and in the rigidity of institutional requirements (i.e. residence, class hours, limited number of classes for part-time students, etc.).

Problems in educational planning for students were assessed by respondents as stemming from stereotyping of women students, whether it be in the grading of class and field performance, in the awarding of stipends, in the assigning of field placements, or in counseling toward specific concentrations. Examples were cited which referred to awarding of higher stipends and research grants to male heads of households rather than to females with the same responsibility.

A handful of respondents noted that they knew of no barriers to equity for physically impaired students. One of these respondents stated that "my program has no barriers for physically impaired students; we don't accept any."

Overview of Responses to Part II

Responses to Part II of the questionnaire focused only on problems or barriers to achieving equity for women. In no way were respondents suggesting that all university settings had all of the above barriers or that these barriers prevented

programs from functioning at an effective level. There did seem to be wide-spread recognition, however, that a quality curriculum which addresses distinctive needs of women must be supported by sound practices and policies which respect the rights and contributions of female and male administrators, faculty, and students.

CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPING SPECIFIC PLANS OF ACTION TO ACHIEVE EQUITY FOR WOMEN

Selection of Program Sites

Responses to the survey conducted by the project confirmed that a large number of administrators of baccalaureate and master's degree programs in social work thought that their programs would be improved by equity efforts directed toward women faculty and staff, and toward curriculum content. Information gathered through the survey showed that many administrators had ideas about strategies to achieve equity for women, but were uncertain about the most productive approaches to organizing efforts within their own programs to carry out these strategies.

Phase II consisted of a planned effort by the project to respond to those who were committed to developing individual plans of achieving equity for women, but who sought the advice of experts on how to proceed. A question had been asked in Part I of the project survey as follows:

During the academic year (1980-1981) project consultants will be available to five programs in Federal regions III, IV, VIII, IX and X. The project will select programs with a range of characteristics. If you would like your program to be considered as one of the five programs, check "yes" below. If your program is selected, you will have an opportunity to discuss and reconsider your decision.

The five Federal regions had been selected for the project before the proposal was submitted to the U.S. Education Department. A review of regions receiving funding from the Women's Educational Equity Act had shown that the five regions selected had submitted fewer proposals for funding.

Forty-one of the programs in Federal regions III, IV, VIII, IX and X were interested, twelve were undecided and eleven were not interested. Sixty-four of the programs outside of Federal regions III, IV, VIII, IX and X also expressed interest in receiving consultation.

Project staff and consultants who acted as an advisory group to the director developed a set of criteria for selection of one program site in each of the five predetermined Federal regions.

Each program site would be invited to develop specific plans during the 1980 to 1981 academic year to achieve equity for women in their own programs. Each program site would be provided a project consultant to assist in its efforts.

Program sites selected were to meet the following criteria:

1. Accredited status
2. Unique combination of characteristics that distinguished it from the other programs selected (i.e. ethnic representation on faculty or in student body, rural or urban location, public or private auspices, ratio of male to female faculty, mission of program, age of student body, etc.)
3. An expressed interest in participating in the project by the administrator.

The five programs selected in Federal regions III, IV, VIII, IX and X did meet these criteria. Time and money limitations prevented the project from providing consultation to all programs meeting the same criteria.

Assignment of Consultants to Program Sites

The project invited the five programs to identify barriers to equity for women in their own settings, and to develop plans of action to overcome barriers. A consultant was provided by the project to assist with the development of strategic models of equity for women during the academic year 1980 to 1981. Each consultant was paid by the project to make the equivalent of three full day on-site visits. In cases where consultants traveled only a short distance to programs, consultation visits were more frequent and were scheduled for portions of a day.

Although each of the five programs selected to participate were asked to be self-directed in the choice of a barrier to equity to be addressed, the project set forth empirical definitions, principles of operation and working agreements in a manual which was available to all involved in the project. The administrator of each program was asked to appoint a work group of faculty and students whose major task would be to identify a problem or barrier to achieving equity for women, and to develop and begin to implement a plan of action to overcome the agreed upon barrier.

Establishment of Working Agreements and Work Groups
at Program Sites

"Contracts" or working agreements were negotiated at several levels. The project director and administrator of each of the five programs agreed upon objectives, time frame, and assignment of a consultant. Each consultant and the dean or director of the program to which she was assigned agreed upon a general plan which included the following commitments:

1. The consultant would make up to three visits to the program during a six-month period for the purpose of sharing expertise and facilitating the efforts of the work group.
2. The work group to be appointed by the dean or director who sanctioned their use of time on the project should include, at the minimum, a representative of the program's curriculum planning committee and a faculty member and student with an orientation and commitment to women's concerns. It would be up to the program to decide whether additional members should be added. Additional members might include the university affirmative action officer or a member of the practice community.
3. The work group would agree to select the barrier to be addressed, and to develop a specific plan of action to overcome the barrier in accordance with project deadlines.
4. The consultant would be responsible for a description of the model developed in the program, and would assist the work group with completing a written plan of action.
5. The five written plans of action and models would be used as the base for a project report and publication, to be prepared by the project director and the consultants by the end of the second year of the project.

Development of Plans of Action by Program Sites

The project set forth guidelines for developing a plan of action, and asked that the following elements be included in the written documents:

1. Overall assessment of status of program's curriculum re distinctive needs of women.
2. Identification of one problem area or barrier to be worked on.

3. Listing of possible strategies to overcome barriers.
4. Selection of specific strategy with discussion of:
 - a. What -- description of strategy.
 - b. Why -- rationale for selection.
 - c. How -- techniques and resources utilized.
 - d. When -- timing and sequence of activities.
 - e. Where-- location of activities.
 - f. Who -- persons involved.
5. Projected products and outcomes.
6. Evaluation of process and procedures.
7. Implications for replication in higher education.

The work group was asked to be responsible for the writing of this plan to be submitted to the project director through the consultant. This request was based on recognition that the document was the program's own plan to be implemented from within the program. It also gave the project director and consultants a chance to see the perspectives of the work group on the objectives of the project.

CHAPTER V

A FRAME OF REFERENCE FOR ACHIEVING EQUITY

During academic year 1980 to 1981 five project consultants worked with administrators and work group members at five program sites to develop unique plans to achieve educational equity for women. At the end of the academic year, project consultants met with the project director to review the work of the project and to decide how to share the knowledge gained from activities at the five program sites with others in social work education. Although the most logical approach was to report on experiences at each of the program sites individually, there was concern about respecting confidentiality. In addition, it became clear that there were common elements in the five experiences.

A decision was made to construct a conceptual frame of reference which would address eight areas of activity assessed as central to efforts to achieve educational equity for women. The frame of reference could be utilized as a base for organizing equity efforts in any social work program whether they be initiated by administrators, faculty or students.

The eight elements common to the five experiences which were selected for the frame of reference are institutional factors, consultant's relationship to the institution and to the social work program, organization of work group, focus of change efforts, selection of strategies for change, projected outcomes, monitoring and evaluation, and institutionalizing the gains.

Key factors are identified and a brief description of related activities that took place in the program sites is given in this chapter. Guidelines for use of each element in the frame of reference are presented in Chapter VI.

Institutional Factors

Factors in the Institution

There are wide variations in characteristics of colleges and universities throughout the country which are parent institutions to the 359 accredited social work programs.⁶ In order to set up an effective working model of educational equity in any of these programs, it is necessary to understand the nature of the parent institution and the special characteristics of the social work program within its walls.

Institutional factors include:

1. Nature of parent institution (i.e., size, facilities, personnel, auspices, hierarchical structure, resources, composition of faculty and study body,

- regional and sociopolitical considerations).
2. Place of social work program within the parent institution (i.e. autonomy, availability of and competition for resources, interdepartmental relationships).
 3. Nature of social work program (i.e. mission, degrees awarded, administration, faculty, students, resource availability, community and regional involvement, alumni, accreditation status).

Nature of Parent Institution

The nature of the parent institution proved to be an important element in the project in that it provided a frame of reference or context for activities within the five program sites. For example, in one program site the mission of the university to provide educational opportunities for "less privileged persons" was reflected in the types of project activities initiated by the work group. In one program site the traditionally conservative orientation of the university was noted as a factor to consider, with some assessment that this factor had less influence on the curriculum than it did in past years.

The parent institutions of the five program sites used in the project have the following characteristics as a group:⁷

Regions of Country: Pacific Coast--one program; Northwest--one program; Southwest--one program, Southeast--one program; Mid-Atlantic Coast--one program.

Location: Urban Area--two programs; Suburbs--two programs; Rural Area--one program.

Auspices: Public-State--four programs; Private-Church related--one program.

Ethnic/Gender Identification: Non-ethnic coeducational--four programs; Black coeducational--one program.

Full-time Enrollment: 2,000-4,999--one program; 5,000-9,999--two programs; 20,000 and over--two programs.

Place of Social Work Program Within Institution

At all program sites, consideration was given to how the development of a model of equity would be received within the

parent institution or within the department within which the social work program was situated. It should be noted that the five program sites elected to focus on change efforts within their own social work programs rather than within the total university, perhaps realizing that they had more control over projected outcomes. However, in all five program sites there were efforts to reach out to use resource persons and materials and to collaborate on projects with faculty from other departments.

Within one program site it was reported that "there was some institutional pressure to cooperate with other departments," which led the work group in that site to make visible efforts to "enhance interdepartmental relationships and shared use of resources." Within two program sites there was an expressed "sensitivity to fiscal problems" within the total institution, and "to a constant pressure to prove the contribution of the social work program" to the institution. The need for long-term change efforts was directed toward the parent institution in one program site, as concern was expressed about equitable advancement, tenure, and salary opportunities for women. In one program site the activities of a work group were extended to include faculty of two other branches with social work programs in the state. In one program site the administrator of the social work program purposefully set up a work group which included several faculty outside of his department who were leaders regarding women's concerns in the university community.

In all five program sites there was an expressed awareness of the importance of a dynamic working relationship between the administrator of the social work program and the hierarchy within the parent institution.

Nature of Social Work Program

Characteristics of the five social work programs selected to be program sites for the project include the following:⁸

Levels of Social Work Education: Graduate only--one program; Joint Graduate and Baccalaureate--one program; Baccalaureate only--three programs.

Accreditation Status: All programs were accredited by the Accreditation Commission of the Council on Social Work Education. Three of the five programs were scheduled for reaccreditation review during the coming year, which meant that they were preparing self-studies showing that they had met the requirements of accreditation standards (including Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women).

Administration of Social Work Programs: Sex: Male Administrators--three programs; Female administrators--two programs. Ethnicity: Caucasian--three programs; Black American--one program; Asian-American--one program.

Full-time Faculty: Number: Six--three programs; fourteen--one program; thirty--one program. Ratio of Male to Female: 50% Male--two programs; 66% Male--two programs; 100% Male--one program. Percentage of Faculty with Tenure: 33%--one program; 40%--two programs; 50%--two programs. Ethnicity (Ratio of Ethnic to Non-Ethnic): 12% Ethnic--two programs; 50% Ethnic--two programs; 66% Ethnic--one program. (Majority of faculty in five program sites from ethnic backgrounds is Black. Several come from Asian-American backgrounds).

Full-time Students: Number: 50 to 100--one program; 100-150--one program; 150-200--one program; 200-250--one program; 400-450--one program. Number to Whom Social Work Degrees Awarded (1978-1979 Academic Year): 25-50 degrees--two programs; 51-75 degrees--two programs; 76-100 degrees--one program. Ratio of Male to Female Students: 20% Male--one program; 35% Male--two programs; 50% Male--two programs. Ethnicity (Ratio of Ethnic to Non-Ethnic): 35-45% Ethnic--four programs; 80% Ethnic--one program. (The largest number of students from ethnic backgrounds was black students from a black university. Students from other programs who were of ethnic backgrounds included sixteen who were black, nine who were Chicano, six who were Native American, three who were Puerto Rican, and one who was Asian-American.)

Consultant's Relationship to the Institution and to the Social Work Program

Factors in the Consultation Process

The consultant was viewed by the project as a person who would draw upon her own expertise and skills to facilitate the development of a model of equity within the program site. The consultation process was viewed as time limited. Success was projected by the project to be the initiation of change efforts to achieve equity for women in social work education that would become self-perpetuating. The project built its approach to consultation on the premise that each accredited social work program site selected had the commitment and adequate resources to take on self-directed quality improvement efforts.

The process of consultation included the following activities:

1. Exploring varying expectations of the consultation process and clarifying reciprocal roles.
2. Establishing a working relationship between the consultant and administrator, with work group members and with other interested faculty and students; meeting individually or in group settings.
3. Establishing a working agreement to decide upon achievable goals, setting up a manageable schedule of work and maintaining focus of project.
4. Installing and using mechanisms for reporting, monitoring, and evaluation.
5. Identifying appropriate resources.
6. Helping to institutionalize gains.
7. Terminating the consultation process.

Stages in the Consultation Process

The relationship of the consultant to the social work program can be described in three stages: initial stage, middle stage, and termination.

Initial Stage:

The initial stage began with the first telephone contact of the consultant with the administrator of the social work program. (This followed the establishment of an overall agreement between the project director and administrator.) In each case the consultant made an appointment to meet with the administrator at the program site.

The administrator of all five program sites had verbalized to the project director an interest in receiving consultation from the project, and had confirmed that they were in agreement with project objectives. They appeared to want to become a part of a national project sponsored by the Council on Social Work Education, and funded by the U.S. Department of Education. All administrators seemed to view the project as assisting them indirectly in updating a part of their programs, which would be reviewed during the reaccreditation process. There was an understanding by all of the administrators that the project was in no way connected with the Council's accreditation process and did not have access to information gathered in accreditation self-studies. During this period it was also important for the consultants to identify themselves as representing the project rather than their own universities or organizations.

Four of the five administrators indicated that they had not done extensive work on curriculum planning regarding women and looked forward to assistance from the consultants. Administrators and work group members in these four programs looked to the consultants to move into their programs as "experts" who would "tell" their faculty what they needed to do to update their programs. The consultants' response to requests to act as "experts" was to reshift the focus to the program sites and to tell administrators and work groups that they were the "experts" on making decisions about what the focus of equity efforts would be within their own programs. The consultants pointed out that there were barriers to equity in all programs of higher education. The consultants would be glad to act as "facilitators" who had knowledge which they would share along the way about educational planning and use of appropriate resources. The fifth program site, where the administrator was viewed nationally as having expertise on women's issues, moved more quickly to accept the role of the consultant as "facilitator" or "catalyst."

In all cases the consultants moved as quickly as possible to establish working agreements and to involve members of work groups in the planning process. During the first on-site consultation visit consultants made contacts with either the total work group or with one to three members.

During the initial stage of consultation, the consultants reported that they carried out the following roles:

- gathered information about the program site, including a general assessment of resources available in the parent institution;
- provided a context for work by defining educational equity, by describing a non-sexist learning environment, by interpreting project objectives;
- set the stage for organizing efforts and the setting of goals by the work group;
- agreed to recommend appropriate resources;
- initiated a time-limited working relationship that was supportive of self-directed efforts within the program site;
- set up a schedule and working agreement;
- clarified that the consultant was a project representative and not a representative of her own institution or of the Council's Accreditation Commission.

During the initial stage, consultants indicated that they made an attempt to understand "where program sites were" in their efforts to achieve equity for women, and what the varied

expectations of persons within the educational program were. Several consultants sensed that they would play a role in mediating dialogue between special interest groups during later stages of consultation.

There was a difference in the number of on-site visits that each consultant would make. Although a total of up to three one-day on-site visits was promised by each consultant, it later proved to be true that the two consultants who lived within driving distance of their program sites made five to seven on-site visits which were of shorter duration than one day. All consultants made themselves available for telephone contacts from administrators and work group members.

Middle Stage:

The middle stage of the consultation process was essentially a "work" stage. In four of the five program sites, one work group had been assigned specific tasks and had agreed to a tight work schedule. In these program sites, the role of the consultant became that of facilitator and resource person (i.e. helping to maintain the focus of the project, meeting with the work group, providing feedback to reports, raising appropriate questions, making constructive suggestions, recommending and providing resource materials, and reviewing the manageability of the work schedule).

In the fifth program, work assignments had been dispersed according to the interest of subgroups. The consultant played a role here in facilitating interaction between and among these subgroups. In all cases the social work administrators participated along with the work groups and consultants in developing a plan to achieve equity.

Termination:

During the termination stage, the focus of consultation shifted back to the reality of completing project activities and reports, and assisting program sites in establishing ongoing mechanisms for monitoring and updating educational programs. The concern of all consultants became how to assist program sites to institutionalize gains resulting from project activities. Consultant efforts during the termination stage were directed toward assisting programs to continue self-help efforts to achieve equity for women. The stage included a review of what had been accomplished and what needed to be worked on in the short-term and long-term future. As appears to be the case with many time-limited consultation efforts,

the consultants believed that the termination stage came upon them too quickly, and they wished that there had been more time to review observable gains from project activities and to assist program sites to set up mechanisms for ensuring long-term gains.

Organization of Work Group

Organizing Factors

One of the requirements of the project was that the administrator of each program site appoint a work group to carry out project goals during academic year 1980-1981. The following stipulations regarding the work group were a part of the agreement established between the administrator of the program site and the project director or consultant:

1. At the minimum, the work group should include a representative of the program site's curriculum committee (or key decisionmaking group), as well as at least one faculty member and at least one student with a demonstrated commitment to women's concerns. The program would decide if additional members should be added to the work group. (Other suggested possible work group members include field instructors and other representatives of the practice community, part-time instructors, alumni, members of women's caucuses, affirmative action officer, faculty outside of the social work program, etc.)
2. The administrator must approve the use of the work group's time on the project.
3. The work group should select a barrier to equity to be addressed, and should develop, with the assistance of the project consultant, a plan of action to achieve equity for women in its program (to improve one aspect of the program as it relates to women).
4. The administrator, at his or her discretion, would serve as a full or ad hoc member of the work group.

Composition of Work Groups

The five program sites used five different types of work groups. One graduate program set up an initial work group

composed of the administrator, two female faculty members and two female students. This group later expanded to include interested faculty from different branches of the university.

The three baccalaureate-only program sites chose three other approaches. One work group included all faculty in the program (male and female), plus three students (female). A second work group included two female students, all faculty at the program site (all male), plus four prominent women in the university (associate dean of women, director of instructional development, professor of English, and professor of anthropology). Another work group was composed of two members of the curriculum committee (male and female), a student (who chose not to attend meetings--female), and a prominent member of the practice community (female administrator), who was also a member of the curriculum committee.

A fifth program site encouraged subgroups to work on specific plans according to their interests. One subgroup of three female students developed a research project with the assistance of their research professor (male), and expanded to include additional female students for discussion group purposes. In addition, informal discussions were held by faculty members about the place of issues concerning women and minority group members in the curriculum.

Operational Questions about Work Groups

Work groups set up their own schedules and met regularly. Consultants arranged to meet with work groups when they were making on-site visits. Administrators also met regularly with work groups.

Experiences at the five program sites showed that the following operational questions need to be considered:

1. Is the work group representative of:
Faculty (full and part-time)?
Students?
Practice Community?
Ethnic Groups?
Special Interest Groups?
2. Is the functioning of all members of the work group maximal or minimal? What is the rationale for short-term participation of some members?
3. Does the work group have decisionmaking power or have a link to decisionmaking groups within the program site?

4. Is the administrator committed to sanction and support the work group?
5. Is the work group an ad hoc structure or an ongoing structure?
6. How does the selection of problems to be worked on affect the composition of work group? Vice versa?
7. Does the work group have a realistic schedule and manageable plan?
8. Does the work group have the respect and support of other groups within the system?
9. What is the nature of the contract between the work group and the administrator and between the work group and the consultant?
10. How are the recommendations of the work group to be implemented? If it is an ad hoc group, who will monitor gains?

Foci of Change Efforts

Factors in Focusing Change Efforts

The following questions were identified as central to the focus of change efforts:

1. What is the barrier or problem area to be focused on?
 - a. What are differing perceptions of this barrier?
 - b. What is at the core of the problem?
2. What is the target of change?
 - a. Is the target attitudes or behavior?
 - b. Is the target policies or procedures or structure?
 - c. Is the target a concrete one such as curriculum syllabi, outlines, bibliographies?
3. What are the target groups that will benefit from the change?

Problem or Barrier to be Addressed

A wide range of questions was considered by administrators and work groups, with the assistance of consultants. These include:

1. Does the social work curriculum adequately address distinctive needs of women?
2. Are students taught to work with female clients from varying sociocultural and economic backgrounds, all age levels and with differing needs?
3. Are persons in the system supportive of the goal of achieving a non-sexist learning environment?
4. Are teaching technologies and curriculum materials unbiased and up to date?
5. Is there an ongoing program of resource and instructional development?
6. Are institutional policies, practices and structures supportive of equity in opportunity and recognition for men and women?
7. Do faculty and students from varying backgrounds and with differing points of view have opportunities to advance and to be recognized within the program?
8. Are there fiscal and other supports (i.e. advisors) available to students?

There appeared to be recognition by work groups at the five program sites that there are barriers or problems that exist in every institutional setting. There was agreement that the answer to question 1 about whether a social work curriculum adequately addresses distinctive needs of women is universally "no." Every program needs periodic updating and improvement in quality. Two of the five program sites decided that they would begin to review the curriculum to see what should be updated and improved. A third program had begun the process several years before and decided to continue the focus on curriculum in depth. The work groups of these three program sites also decided, with the assistance of administrators and consultants, to proceed to address questions 2,3,4 and 5 (practice teaching, support in environment, teaching technologies and curriculum materials, resource and instructional development).

Question 6 regarding structures, policies and practices was not given priority by program sites, although some problems were recognized in relation to equal pay and advancement for faculty and staff. The five programs decided to give priority to questions where they thought change could be initiated within the time limitations of the project, and within the confines of the social work program. Question 8 regarding

supports available to students was indirectly addressed by all work groups, with the emphasis on non-fiscal supports. (It is interesting to note that program sites did not interpret the objectives of the project as that of urging program sites to spend large amounts of money on developing resources. All program sites indicated that they had some money available for addition of resource materials as needed.)

The work group at the fourth program began with question 3, which asks whether persons in the system are supportive of the goal of achieving a non-sexist learning environment. This group chose to focus on whether administration and faculty within the social work program were perceived to be sexist in attitudes or behavior. This program site raised the question with students and alumni.

The focus of the fifth program was on question 7, which asks, do faculty and students from varying backgrounds and with differing points of view have opportunities to advance and to be recognized within the program? This program focused its attention on how persons can tap expertise gained from life experiences so that they can utilize the educational program to achieve career goals. Basic to their concerns were issues relating both to women and to members of ethnic minority groups. It should be noted that this focus is in line with the stated mission of the parent institution of that program site.

Targets of Change

Three of the work groups clearly focused on curriculum as the target. The fourth work group began addressing attitudes of administration and faculty within the social work program. The fifth addressed educational needs of learners from varying backgrounds.

Target Groups

It was clear that all work groups hoped that the primary group to benefit from project efforts would be the student group. However, the second target group to benefit from project efforts was clearly established as social work faculty. In addition, there was an implicit assumption that clients in the social work profession would receive the benefit of enhanced professional functioning. Both men and women in the social work program (administration, faculty, staff, students) were perceived as benefiting from the sensitizing of students and faculty to more effective ways to ensure equality of opportunity. At one program site, one target group

became the spouses of female students, who pointed out the importance of having the support of "significant others" as one pursues a demanding career.

Selection of Strategies for Change

Factors in Selection of Strategies

The following questions should be considered in selecting strategies or vehicles for change:

1. What is the range of strategies possible?
 - a. Are current ones being used effectively?
 - b. Are new approaches needed?
2. Who will be the change agent(s), what is the power and capacity of the change agent(s) within the total system, and is networking among change agents and members of target groups needed?
3. What is the most manageable strategy to initiate the process of change within the constraints of personnel, resources, and time?
4. How do alternative strategies affect special interest groups?
5. How can strategies fit into long-range plans to benefit the educational system?

A major assumption made explicit by the project was that there is no perfect strategy to overcome a specific barrier to achieving equity. There are alternative strategies which have varying degrees of effectiveness in different settings. This is an important principle to social work educational programs, which show wide variations throughout the country. It was the hope of the project that each of the five program sites would "shed some light" on what the most effective change strategies are within educational settings with specific kinds of characteristics.

Alternative Strategies Used in Project

Work groups at the five program sites selected a variety of strategies to carry out the plans they developed. These fell into categories of strategies directed toward curriculum content, toward instructional development, toward resource development, and toward meeting educational needs of students. The strategies listed on the following pages were carried out at one or more of the program sites. The wording of the strategies is taken from reports of consultants and of administrators

and members of work groups at the five program sites.

Curriculum Strategies:

- identified content on women as "mainstream" and applicable to required course content;
- incorporated content into frame of reference used to "mainstream" minority content into core curriculum;
- developed a theoretical frame of reference to organize student learnings in every course in curriculum; used model to integrate thinking about women and men in every radical and ethnic group, every social class, and at every critical life situation;
- reviewed and made changes in content in all required and elective courses;
- offered new elective courses (such as Women and Self Esteem, Women and Career Development, etc.);
- disseminated material to faculty on incorporating content on women into basic methods, Human Behavior and Social Environment, and social policy courses;
- updated syllabi and bibliographies for each course
- set up an open forum to evaluate curriculum.

Instructional Development Strategies:

- carried out a plan for instructional development to improve course presentations, with attention to how and when to introduce a non-sexist perspective and how to deal with sexism in textbooks;
- incorporated concept of equity at every level of teaching;
- asked each faculty member to focus on proposing changes in one required course, to be acted on and implemented during following academic year;
- held discussions about course content in open sessions in which faculty made public commitments to change efforts;
- supported ongoing work of individual faculty members already involved in individual efforts to update curriculum content on women;
- developed an outreach plan to assist women social workers in agencies in better use of new content related to women; planned collaboration of classroom faculty with field faculty to reinforce teaching in each setting;
- developed a questionnaire to evaluate whether sexism permeated any aspect of teaching in the social work program;
- invited faculty members in the university community to share their expertise on women's issues with social work faculty.

Resource Development Strategies:

- provided samples of course outlines, bibliographies, national publications;
- sought information about resources used in other program sites, in other social work programs, and in the parent institutions;
- developed list of persons working on similar issues in social work education;
- explored possible future involvement of professionals in the practice community in change efforts.

Strategies Directed Toward Students:

- initiated a research project focused on how social work students can draw upon previous knowledge, skills, and experience to advance in educational program and in career development;
- planned sessions with spouses of female students to gain their support in career advancement;
- surveyed students and alumni for ideas about improving social work programs as they relate to women;
- solicited input into curriculum revision from the student body;
- developed a plan to measure student learning.

Change Agents

The direct change agents in this project were the five administrators and members of work groups at the program sites. The consultants acted as facilitators of the change process.

In addition, program sites directed its efforts through using the assistance of one or more of the following groups of change agents:

1. administrators (associate and assistant deans or directors)
2. curriculum committees and heads of curriculum areas
3. faculty in the social work program (full-time, part-time, class, field)
4. students
5. alumni
6. members of the practice community
7. persons with expertise on women's issues in the total university.

The experience of the project confirmed in practice what is known in theory: that a change agent cannot function

effectively unless he or she has a direct link to those who make decisions within the hierarchy of the university.

Projected Outcomes

Factors in Projecting Outcomes

The following questions should be considered in projecting outcomes of planned change:

1. What are the short-term changes that can be achieved?
2. What are the long-term changes that can be achieved?
3. How can short-term and long-term change be measured?

The following outcomes were projected by project administrators and work groups:

1. A climate for attitudinal change of both men and women, which is demonstrated by concern, optimism, respect for diverse stands on issues, and use of non-sexist language in classrooms and in university.
2. A structure for dialogue on issues related to women which includes consideration of theories taught, roles imposed by society, preparation of women for administrative positions, and diverse stands on issues.
3. A source of educational materials which has been reviewed for sexist language, and which has new and improved documents.
4. A public commitment to long-term institutional change directed at barriers to equal opportunity for women.
5. A plan for ongoing monitoring of curriculum dealing with women's concerns, which is carried out periodically with involvement of faculty and other appropriate persons.
6. A conceptual framework for incorporating content on persons of varying social statuses.
7. A plan for incorporating women's content into social work courses, and for ensuring non-sexist approaches to teaching.

8. A plan to test outcomes for all students at graduation in general areas of minority content, content on women, and sexist bias.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Factors in Monitoring and Evaluation

Questions which should be considered in setting up monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are:

1. In regard to area to be monitored, what were the original goals established, by whom, and when were they instituted?
2. What are the most appropriate monitoring mechanisms to use?
3. Who will do the monitoring, and to whom are the monitors accountable?
4. What will be done with the results of monitoring?
5. Are mechanisms for monitoring permanent or temporary?

Monitoring and Evaluation at Program Sites

The consultant played a role at each site in establishing the principle that the project was concerned that activities at the program site be carried out in such a way that there was a permanent impact of benefit to each program. In order to accomplish this, it was necessary to build in mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation which would extend beyond the time-limited involvement of the project.

The following are experts from reports from the program sites which demonstrate the kinds of monitoring undertaken by the work groups:

The charge to the work group was viewed as including the monitoring and evaluation function. The group took responsibility for this at every stage of work, and the outcomes of the evaluation supported an outreach approach to other faculty members. Activities included avoiding difficulties encountered, strengthening areas of promise, building support among administrators, assuring that the program's curriculum committee utilizes the learnings from the work group experience.

The work group examined the curriculum to determine the validity of its assumption that every curriculum area was touched by new perspectives on women, and that the

good that already existed in the curriculum (regarding equity for women) would be maintained as new dimensions were built in. They worked to see that supports were organized for the isolated women working in administrative positions, whether in the university or in a social work agency, and that the program continue to be sensitive to students, graduates, and faculty with family responsibilities.

Institutionalizing the Gains

Factors in Institutionalizing Gains

Questions to consider in institutionalizing gains are:

1. How can the work group incorporate planning for institutionalizing gains into its efforts from the beginning?
2. Who are the key persons outside the work group whose support is needed?
3. How can the work group interpret its efforts and products so that they will have meaning for the broader university community?

Institutionalizing Gains at Program Sites

At the time of completion of this report, program sites will not have had time to complete plans for institutionalizing gains from the project. Four out of five work groups initiated through the project have agreed to continue with plans through the following academic year. As mentioned earlier in the report, there was an intention on the part of administrators to use gains from the project as a way of meeting the requirements of Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women. One program site reported that its work group had joined efforts with others in the university to make recommendations to benefit women to the university faculty senate. Another program site reported that it would extend its activities to persons at other branches of the university. If the project had not had a time-limited period, it would have been possible for consultants to provide more assistance to work groups in their efforts to institutionalize gains from the project.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND GUIDELINES

This report has presented an overview of activities conducted during two phases of the Project on Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education between July 1, 1979 and June 30, 1981. The project had as its major objectives the seeking of information about alternative strategies to achieve educational equity, and the construction of a frame of reference which could be used universally to organize efforts to improve the quality of educational programs as they relate to female administrators, faculty and students, and to curriculum content which addresses distinctive needs of women. The ultimate aim of the project was to identify alternative strategies to improve educational programs for both men and women, and to gain a clearer understanding of how a non-sexist learning environment can be achieved. Guidelines for initiating equity efforts are presented here.

Historical Perspective

Chapter I of this report gave a brief history of events leading up to the writing of this report. The events were the adoption of an Affirmative Action Standard for Women (1234B-Women) by the Council on Social Work Education in 1977, and the funding of the Project on Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education by the U.S. Education Department, Women's Educational Equity Act Program in 1979. It has been noted in the report that the project did not become part of the Council's accreditation process, although the focus of the project was on the three areas identified in Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women (i.e. faculty, students, curriculum).

Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education: An Overview

Chapter II summarizes 226 responses to Part I of a questionnaire seeking information from social work programs about curriculum content in which women's distinctive needs are addressed. The chapter provides a brief overview of content on women in required courses (class and field), and in elective courses. In addition, it summarizes findings on who makes recommendations and decisions about the curriculum, on extracurricular opportunities regarding women's concerns, and on plans programs have for revision of curriculum.

The project did not obtain any clear picture of the rationale for inclusion of content on women in required courses or of the nature of content that is included or excluded in class and field courses. Programs do appear to be using a wide range of field placements, including crisis-oriented centers, which is a relatively new type of service for women. A wide range of elective courses appears to be offered. Once again the general nature of the responses did not reveal the rationale for selection of specific kinds of electives and for explaining how general courses such as Women and Art or Women and Philosophy are linked to the objectives of the social work curriculum.

There was some indication from the 226 responses received that there are different curriculum decisionmakers at the baccalaureate and master's levels. It would appear that priority decisions are made more by groups (i.e. curriculum committees) at the master's level, and by individuals (i.e. faculty member teaching a course) at the baccalaureate level. This difference, which could be explained by a larger number of faculty at the graduate level, may explain why certain kinds of decisions are made at both levels, and why the pace of the curriculum revision process is often slow.

Most respondents indicated that their programs conduct extra-curricular activities that pertain to women's concerns. These appeared to be sporadic and initiated by special interest groups. Most plans for revision of curriculum centered around a review of existing courses. Perhaps these 1980 answers reflected a general response to the adoption of Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women several years before. Plans beyond a review of existing curriculum focused primarily on adding specific courses. A number did announce plans focused toward faculty development.

Chapter III summarized 131 anonymous responses to Part II of the questionnaire which sought information about barriers to achieving equity for women. Barriers which are reported to exist in a number of programs include barriers in curriculum planning and teaching, and non-curriculum barriers which relate to the profession, to the institution, to administrators and faculty, and to students.

The first section of Part II of the questionnaire addressed barriers in curriculum planning and teaching. Underlying most responses to this part was the thought that many social work programs have not gone far enough in developing rationales for inclusion of content on women, in testing the use of alternative teaching technologies and materials, and in measuring student learning. In addition, there was a plea for the establishment of a more open climate where differing views can be examined freely.

The second part of Part II of the questionnaire addressed non-curriculum barriers. Here there was a general recognition that there must be more than just curriculum supports if a non-sexist learning environment is to be achieved. Many respondents believed that sexism is an inherent part of higher education and of the social work profession. If change is to occur there must be a revision in policies and practices, and an improvement in general attitudes. Perhaps because answers to Part II of the questionnaire were given anonymously, the section on barriers affecting administration and faculty evoked responses which were emotionally charged, and which were accompanied by numerous examples of inequities experienced by women in higher education.

Developing Five Specific Plans of Action to Achieve Equity

Chapter IV summarizes activities used to select five program sites to develop unique models or plans of action to achieve equity for women, to assign consultants to program sites, and to establish working agreements and work groups in the program sites. A great deal of time was spent during the first year of the project in developing a manual, orienting persons involved in project activities, and developing a workable plan. These activities were useful in setting directions for the two years. In retrospect the project would have had a greater impact if the time had been extended to three years instead of two. An additional year would have given program sites more time to carry out plans of action, and would have given consultants more time to evaluate the gains with administrators and work group members at program sites.

A Frame of Reference for Achieving Equity

Chapter V presents a conceptual frame of reference which addresses eight areas of activity which were central to project efforts. Key elements to consider in developing models or plans to achieve educational equity are institutional factors, consultant's relationship to program, organization of work group, focus of change efforts, selection of strategies for change, projected outcomes, monitoring and evaluation, and institutionalizing the gains.

The importance of the first element in the frame of reference, institutional factors, should not be underestimated. Any plan for quality improvement in a program must be developed with a clear understanding of the nature of the system it is a part

of. The project learned that quality improvement efforts, no matter how small, can be made visible in such a way that the social work program is viewed as striving to improve the image of the parent institution. This is especially important during a period when there are extreme fiscal stresses and a competition for resources. Resource persons within the parent institution and within the surrounding region can make valuable contributions to the social work program. In addition, the size of the social work program and the background of its administrators, faculty, staff, and students will influence priority setting. It is important to understand how special interest groups relate to the decisionmaking hierarchy.

The second element in the frame of reference, the consultant's relationship to the institution and to the social work program, was central to the efforts of the project. The consultant was viewed as a knowledgeable person who has skills in communication and who is a facilitator in a process that is self directed. It is suggested that, while it can be productive to hire a consultant from outside of the program, if this is not possible there may be one or two persons with the same type of skills within the educational setting itself. The role of the consultant or resource person should be clearly defined as time-limited and as focused on the objectives determined by the administrator and work group. The discussion in Chapter V focused primarily on the roles assumed by the consultant. In addition, communication and relationship skills are key to the success of the professional consultant.

Organizing a work group is a third factor in the frame of reference. The project set down its own value orientation that stated: 1. a member of the decisionmaking hierarchy should be a part of the work group (rationale: it is not helpful to make recommendations unless there is a link to a decisionmaking group); and 2. at least one faculty member and student with a commitment to women's issues should be a part of the work group (rationale: there are faculty and students in many educational settings with some degree of expertise on women's concerns who are not a part of the decisionmaking hierarchy). In this project there was a strong commitment evident on the part of the majority of work group members. The success of this project is also due to the involvement and interest of the deans and directors who met regularly with the work groups. A conscientious group of persons was a key factor in the success of project activities.

A fourth element in the frame of reference is the focus of change efforts. Selection of the focus of change efforts was

influenced in this project by the limitation of time. It should be noted again that the targets of change were within the social work program and were focused on curriculum. If the focus had been on non-curriculum barriers, the target range would probably have had to be shifted to the parent institution, and the work groups would have had to be expanded. Since statistics in higher education show that there continues to be an unevenness in the salaries paid to men and women, equity efforts directed toward promotion and reimbursement would have to be targeted outside of the social work program.

A fifth element in the frame of reference is the selection of strategies. Selection of strategies most appropriate for a particular change effort is influenced by the choice of target, target groups, and change agents. While most of the strategies explicated by the project were directed at material things (i.e. syllabi, course outlines, bibliographies, etc.), there was an underlying assumption that attitudes must also be modified if change is to occur. Success in the selection of appropriate strategies is directly related to the extent of knowledge and commitment of work group members and to the sanction of administrative staff. Availability of resources was not a major problem for the five program sites used in the project.

A sixth element in the frame of reference is projected outcomes. Outcomes projected by the program sites included three types: outcomes related to curriculum content, outcomes related to mechanisms put into place to review and monitor curriculum content, and outcomes which related to attitudinal change.

A seventh element is monitoring and evaluation. Basic to the project approach was its belief that monitoring and evaluation must accompany any change effort if change was to become permanent. In all five program sites an attempt was made to evaluate ongoing project efforts and to institute permanent review mechanisms.

The last element in the frame of reference is institutionalizing gains. Program sites reported that this was a goal that they were working to achieve. They reported plans to include more persons in their activities, to use gains to meet the requirements of an ongoing accreditation standard, and to make recommendations to university-wide groups to achieve equity for women.

Limitations and Problems

All quality improvement efforts have strengths and limitations. This summary has focused on what was reported to have been accomplished at program sites by project consultants, administrators, and members of work groups. It was evident that there was a positive climate established at all program sites that demonstrated their commitment to efforts to achieve equity for women. At the same time there was a realistic attitude which recognized that short-term efforts can be limited in impact.

The following limitations and problems were identified by those involved in the project:

1. Time and money were major limitations in that they determined that consultants would be provided by the project for less than an academic year;
2. The program sites targeted their efforts first on required classroom courses which are usually taught by full-time faculty. Field instructors were not included in work groups. It is hoped that work groups which continue will recognize this as a limitation and will expand their groups to include field instructors and part-time faculty.
3. Special attention should be given to address the particular concerns of women of color on faculties and in student bodies.
4. Outreach to alumni will be essential to pick up the slack in curriculum content taught before the new frame of reference was introduced.
5. Continuing support should be provided administrators as they move to institutionalize outcomes of the project.
6. Attention needs to be given to continuing education programs.
7. There needs to be continued support of project gains by the Council on Social Work Education's Accreditation Commission's monitoring of 1234B-Women.
8. The tendency of some programs to label themselves as being "no problem" programs needs to be reexamined

in light of current statistics on salaries and promotion of men and women in higher education.

9. The program sites chose to focus on curriculum. This focus should not be to the exclusion of other non-curriculum areas which are needed to support new directions in curriculum.
10. This summary is based on reports of activities and future plans. The real test of project gains will be seen in the everyday efforts at the program sites.

Guidelines for Use of the
Frame of Reference to Achieve Equity

It is recommended that persons who wish to initiate change efforts consider the following questions as a guide to use of the frame of reference developed by the project.

Institutional Factors

What is the nature of the parent institution?

What is the place of the social work program within the parent institution?

What is the nature of the social work program?

- Its mission?
- Its curriculum?
- Its faculty?
- Its student body?
- Its alumni?
- Its relationship to the practice community?

How has the parent institution and the social work program addressed the need of equity for women in the past?

Have there been recent efforts directed toward achieving equity for women?

Consultant's Relationship to the Parent Institution and to the Social Work Program

Is there someone with expertise in the parent institution or social work program who could act as a facilitator of change?

Is there something to be gained from bringing in a consultant from outside the program? Are there resources available?

Is the administrator willing to work with a consultant? With a facilitator from within the program?

Organization of Work Group

Who would be the best persons to appoint to a work group?
Consider the following factors:

- Nature of problem(s) to be addressed
- Representativeness of potential member
- Authority of potential member
- Commitment of potential member to equity issues
- Expertise of potential member
- Schedule of potential member

Will the administrator sanction the efforts and time of the work group members?
What will be the linkages of the work group with decisionmaking authority?

Focus of Change Efforts

What is the barrier or problem area to be focused on and how is it perceived by persons in the program?
What is to be the target for change?
What are the target groups that will benefit from change?

Selection of Strategies for Change

What is the range of strategies possible?
How do alternative strategies impact on special interest groups?
Which strategies are the most manageable?
Who will be the change agent? What is his or her authority within the system?
How do strategies fit into long-range planning?

Projected Outcomes

What are short-term changes that can be achieved?
What are long-term changes that can be achieved?
How can short-term and long-term change be measured?

Monitoring and Evaluation

In regard to area to be monitored, what were the original goals established, by whom, and when were they instituted?
What are the most appropriate monitoring mechanisms to use?
Who will do the monitoring and to whom are the monitors accountable?
What will be done with the results of monitoring?
Are mechanisms for monitoring permanent or temporary?

Institutionalizing the Gains

How can the work group incorporate planning for institutionalizing gains from the beginning?

Who are the key persons outside the work group whose support is needed?

How can the work group interpret its efforts and products so that they have meaning for the university community?

Toward A Non-Sexist Learning Environment

The ultimate aim of the project was to explore approaches to achieving an environment in higher education which respects and supports equality for men and women in all parts of the educational system. The project used funding from the U.S. Education Department, Women's Educational Equity Act Program, to explore alternative strategies to overcome barriers to equity for women in social work education. It is the belief of those involved in the project that quality improvement efforts directed toward equity for women will ultimately benefit men as well as women. Basic to project efforts was the belief also that women from differing backgrounds must benefit from equity efforts if they are to be effective.

There must be strong leadership from responsible persons in higher education to support visible efforts to achieve equity for persons who, because of ethnic, racial or religious backgrounds, because of sex, because of age or because of physical impairment, continue to receive less than equal treatment within the university system. This sentiment was expressed by a large number of social work educators in their responses to questions posed to them by the project. In addition many expressed the belief that a non-sexist teaching-learning environment that respects equality for all persons is achievable in social work educational settings.

The following paragraph provides a composite definition of a non-sexist learning environment which is based on responses of social work educators to the project questionnaire:

A non-sexist learning environment is an environment in which teachers have a passion for teaching, scholars have a passion for discovery, students have a passion for learning, moral leadership is practiced by those in a position to do so...Men and women are recognized and accepted for the ways in which they are alike and different, respecting them for the contributions

they make and ensuring that the perspectives of both sexes appear as components of a learning environment; Men and women are free to experience, voice and express their differences and similarities in the context of their learning to become professional social workers with a highly developed capacity for professional use of self in the service of others...sexist behavior and attitudes are as unacceptable as racism or ageism or negative attitudes and behaviors toward persons with handicapping conditions.

It is suggested that readers will want to reflect on whether the above definition of a non-sexist learning environment describes the commitment of educational settings with which they have been identified and whether it describes their own professional and personal value orientations. This publication is presented with the hope that it will provide a general frame of reference and a guide to those committed to ongoing efforts to initiate, maintain and monitor educational equity activities in social work programs throughout the United States.

NOTES

1. Accreditation Division, Council on Social Work Education, Memo to Deans and Directors of Accredited Social Work Programs, December 30, 1977.
2. Ibid.
3. Listings of accredited programs published by the Council on Social Work Education: Colleges and Universities with Accredited Undergraduate Social Work Programs and Schools of Social Work with Accredited Master's Degree Programs, 1979.
4. Accreditation Division memo, op. cit., p. 1.
5. Ibid.
6. Listings, op. cit.
7. Council on Social Work Education. Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1979. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1980.
8. Ibid.